

**Puget Sound Leadership Council
Meeting Summary
La Quinta Conference Center
1425 East 27th Street
Tacoma, Washington
May 27 & 28, 2009**

May 27, 2009 - DAY 1

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Billy Frank, Jr.
- Diana Gale
- Dan O'Neal
- Steve Sakuma
- Bill Wilkerson

- ECB Chair Dave Somers

Staff and Other Presenters:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Lynda Ransley, Deputy Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Chris Townsend, Special Assistant to Executive Director
- Paul Bergman, Communications Director
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
- Mary Ruckelshaus, Puget Sound Partnership Chief Scientist
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Bill Frank, Jr.
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Jim Cahill, Director of Accountability & Budget

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting.
A full recording of this meeting is retained by Puget Sound Partnership as the formal record.*

Action Items:

- Approve October 22-23, 2008, Meeting Summary
- Approve PSAR Project List
- Approve ESRP Project List
- Approve Revised Action Agenda
- Decide on Monitoring Governance

Meeting Summary:

- Agency Progress Report and Around the Sound Updates
- Puget Sound Science Update
- Action Agenda Strategic Priorities

- Performance Management Communication Tools
- Agency and Regional Communication Update
- Leadership Council Operations

Day 1

CALL TO ORDER – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and reviewed the agenda for the meeting, highlighting decision items and process discussions.

AGENCY PROGRESS REPORT AND AROUND THE SOUND UPDATES

David Dicks provided an update on what has happened with Puget Sound Partnership since the last meeting:

- *2009 Legislative Session* – The Legislature has adjourned without a special session. The Partnership ended the session with a 9% total budget cut, which we view as a monumental success. David thanked everyone who worked on the legislative issues this session and highlighted three other legislative issues related to the Partnership:
 - A proviso was passed requiring the aligning of state agency budgets with the Action Agenda
 - A “user-pays” tug rescue plan was passed for the Neah Bay tug. The boating industry has a year to come up with a cost-share plan on how to fund this or Ecology will decide for them
 - The Oil Spill Advisory Council (OSAC) was not refunded and the authority to oversee the program has been given to the Partnership, along with \$150,000 to do an assessment of the program. We are partnering with Ecology to evaluate this program - trying to figure out how to take this on and have a strong, meaningful oversight program within the Partnership
- *Mitigation Reform* – Chris Townsend has been working on an in-lieu fee program as a way to pay for environmental work. David explained the three steps to a mitigation process (avoid, minimize, last would be mitigate). The goal is to avoid or minimize the need to mitigate. David noted that there is some concern with this program but staff is working on these issues. It is a voluntary program and will not work in every area or for every situation.
- *Watershed Characterization* – This predicates getting the mitigation work in place. Chris Townsend reported on an upcoming meeting scheduled with the Department of Ecology and how this meeting is the first step in getting this work done. This work is refinement of existing work and adding of additional information. The outreach/communications for local application and public stewardship will be important.
- *Partner Designation Process* – There is much interest from local jurisdictions about the partner designation process. Non-profits may be included as well as state grant and loan recipients. Staff is still trying to sort out what the partnership designation should look like. Also need to work with the state grant and loan

people on what being a partner means and how much benefit you would get if designated a partner. We need to have a balance on getting people involved and included, but not let everyone be a partner, which would dilute the importance of being a partner.

- *Accountability System* – There will be a presentation on this later in the meeting and the three-day work session that was held to start work on logic models
- *Local Integration and Implementation* – David reported that the Partnership is merging the Action Area Liaisons with the Salmon Managers into one team with Joe Ryan leading this group. The plan is to bring the salmon and ecosystem issues under one umbrella.
- *Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery (PCSR) Funds* – There was a glitch with the PCSR Funds being written out of the federal budget. But through lots of work and congressional support, we were able to get \$50 million back into the budget. This was the single change in the Obama budget.
- *Stimulus Money* – Two projects have been funded: 1) Nisqually dike removal, which will double the amount of estuary in the South Sound; and 2) removal of the Elwha dams by 2011 (possibly 2010). Although we wish we weren't in the current economic situation, it is good to see the projects getting done
- *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Funding* - Another \$20 million has been identified for Puget Sound through EPA. Staff is working on the distribution details with EPA and thanked Tom Eaton for his good work.

Diana Gale asked how the Leadership Council is going to take a concept and turn it into an action. For example, how are we going to go from discussion to process with the OSAC? She suggested flagging issues during the meeting, summarizing the list of issues at the end of the meeting, and then keeping track of status. Council agreed to flag issues for staff.

Bill asked both Joe Ryan and Chris Townsend to come forward for the next two agenda items.

Chris introduced Paul Cereghino, who will present the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) information.

SALMON RECOVERY COUNCIL – Joe Ryan (See meeting materials for details.)

Joe Ryan presented the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funds project list for Leadership Council approval, which will send the list on to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). This list of projects is for funds that will arrive on July 1 and is an accelerated round to get the projects going during this construction season. There are \$33 million of state funds for PSAR projects. There is more flexibility with these funds to also fund supplementation programs and they are not distributed within the ordinary cycle as the regular SRFB funds. Joe reviewed the process used to develop

this list. The funds were for ready-to-go projects only. Due to the amount of work generated by the federal stimulus process not as many of these projects were ready to go as we would have liked. The list of projects will go before the SRFB next week for its approval.

Martha Kongsgaard asked for clarification on what the value added is for the Leadership Council to approve this list. Joe reported that the Partnership and Leadership Council is in charge of the Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) and this is a safety valve to make sure the Council is comfortable with the process used to develop the list.

The Council discussed concern with redundancy and loss of efficiencies. They asked staff to find ways to limit the redundancy. The Council wants to make sure the best projects in Puget Sound are getting funded and that we're not just spreading the funds across the Sound. The other need is to have broad enough criteria to consider the ecosystem, not just salmon needs. Joe will draft a process for Council approval.

The other concern was the need for accountability and funding of the effectiveness monitoring.

Diana Gale **MOVED** approval of the process used to get to the PSAR project list. Billy Frank Jr., **SECONDED**. Council **APPROVED** the PSAR project list approval process as presented.

ESRP PROJECT LIST APPROVAL – Chris Townsend and Paul Cereghino (See meeting materials for details.)

Chris Townsend and Paul Cereghino presented the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) project list for Leadership Council approval. Chris reviewed the process used to develop the final list presented to the Council at this meeting. This again is the approval of the process used to get to the list of projects being presented at this meeting.

Paul explained these are the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP) projects, and that this is a partnership between the Department of Fish and Wildlife and Corps of Engineers to develop a general investigation (GI) and identify projects needing to be completed. This is the fourth spending plan and is all state funds. This year there is \$7 million available. The Action Agenda recommends completion of the GI. There is confusion between the PSNERP and the Partnership, and staff are now looking at ways to merge the efforts and create efficiencies.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted the need to coordinate these efforts with Joe Ryan and the salmon recovery funds.

Council noted they are being asked to approve a list for \$9 million but there is only \$7 million available. Paul explained that this is to provide a list of alternate projects so that if any of the projects don't meet requirements, they can fund further down the list and not have to start the process over again.

Paul provided a quick overview of the ESRP funding plan development process.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the processes could be integrated to be more efficient and productive. The Council would like to see a coordinated funding system as long as the outcome is positive for the ecosystem.

The Council asked Paul to work with Partnership staff to find a way to identify efficiencies to address project priorities across different fund sources with different objectives, and aligned with the Action Agenda and identify the role of Leadership Council in the process.

Paul then gave an overview of the nine projects before the Council.

Diana Gale **MOVED** approval of the process to get to the ESRP project list. Billy Frank Jr. **SECONDED**. Council **APPROVED** the ESRP project list process as presented.

APPROVAL OF UPDATED ACTION AGENDA – Martha Neuman (See meeting materials for details.)

David introduced this agenda item, explaining that when we did the original Action Agenda we didn't meet all the criteria for the National Estuary Program (NEP) and the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) where we get funds. For example, the comment period should have been 30 day's; it was only two-weeks.

Martha Neuman presented the revised Action Agenda for Leadership Council approval. She reviewed the process used and reason for the need to revise the Action Agenda. After her presentation and Council discussion the Council was asked to approve the revised document.

Martha Kongsgaard **MOVED** approval of the updated Action Agenda. Bill Wilkerson **SECONDED**. Council **APPROVED** the updated Action Agenda as presented.

David thanked Martha Neuman for her work on revision to the Action Agenda, as no one should have to write a plan and then rewrite it within the same year. He also thanked John Gabrielson with EPA for his assistance in this process. We should get the approval decision from EPA by the end of June or early July.

Martha Neuman also thanked Angie Thomson for her efforts re-reading all 1,200 comments.

PUGET SOUND SCIENCE UPDATE – Mary Ruckelshaus (See meeting materials for details.)

Mary Ruckelshaus presented this agenda item for Leadership Council direction. She reviewed the proposed process the Science Panel plans to use and reasons for it. After her presentation and Council discussion, Mary will:

- Sequence production of this document to get the statutorily required portions complete by April 2010 and will then build off this information to complete the final information
- Solicit author teams – hoping to do this in June
- Use the same rigorous peer review process as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
- Use a WIKI type Web system, which we can update with new information as we learn more
- Develop an approval and review process before new information is uploaded

Mary reported that staff is just getting started on development of a review process for the whole science program and will include review of the Biennial Science Work Plan, Strategic Science Plan, and other science reports.

At this point in the meeting, Congressman Dicks joined the group.

Congressman Dicks explained the issue with the PCSRF funding. The mistake was corrected through a budgetary amendment. This was the only budgetary amendment made in the whole document. He is going to try to get more than \$50 million, but that is where the funding is currently. He is also trying to get more money for the Mitchell Act funds, which help the hatcheries.

He reported that the administration has increased funding for the Great Lakes, and there is strong support for that. But he also thinks that the other estuaries (Chesapeake and Puget Sound) may get additional funds. He discussed the need to help some of the rural communities with funds and ways to pay back the loans. The President is holding a higher standard and science is fundamental to get the answers. The Partnership has done a great job by having a science side to it.

The one issue he believes we have to confront is the inbreeding of hatchery and wild salmon – get the stray rates down. If you do this it will lower the restoration costs. We need to protect both the salmon and the Puget Sound.

He discussed a buoy project being done by the University of Washington's Applied Physics Lab, the Navy, and a company from Port Townsend (Mobilisa). These buoy stations will relay real time data from locations around the Sound and will be a great asset in our research efforts.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound, spoke about the Oil Spill Advisory Council (OSAC). She reported that the OSAC will be on hiatus for two years starting June 30. The OSAC legislation was passed in 2005. The purpose of the Council was to provide constant vigilance against oil spills, do studies on risk factors, and work on issues such as the rescue tug. She would suggest the Leadership Council meet with the OSAC before June 30. If they don't meet with the full committee, they should at least meet with the members of the executive committee.

Fred Felleman, Wave Consulting, has two clients concerned with the oil spills and how the Partnership takes on this big issue. He has been working on a draft document and will leave for the Council to look at. He supports Naki's suggestion for a meeting with the OSAC. We need to recognize there is need for improvement and we need to focus on one Action Area at a time and share learning. He suggested the Council make use of the tribal fishing fleets for pulling booms through the water. There is incentive to get the tribes to be part of oil spill prevention and would provide funds for training the tribes to be oil spill responders. He believes the Marine Spill Response Corporation (MSRC) and others would be glad to help fund this. The Makah Tribe is very supportive and would be happy to pilot this program.

ACTION AGENDA: STRATEGIC PRIORITIES – Bill Ruckelshaus, David Dicks and Martha Neuman (See notebook handout for details.)

Chair Ruckelshaus introduced this agenda item, explaining that the Action Agenda identifies key activities needed to restore Puget Sound by 2020. Today's discussion is to provide staff guidance and feedback on selecting near term priorities to form the work plan for the next two to four years. This information will be taken to the Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) for input in July and back to the Leadership Council for final approval.

New ECB Chair Dave Somers provided his thoughts on moving the ECB forward. He is excited to be the new chair and has been meeting with individual ECB members to get their views. He provided an overview of his background, noting that he enjoys the interface of science and policy. At the last ECB meeting there was a lot of energy and discussion on the role of the ECB. Everyone around the table is interested in saving Puget Sound – he is looking at how to mobilize that energy and talent to support Leadership Council and Puget Sound.

Martha Kongsgaard is impressed with the people around the table of the ECB and would encourage them to be creative in finding ways to do the work.

The Council discussed how the people around the ECB table are the ones who are going to be the ones to do the implementation work and will need to find the best way to do that work. We need to give them some work and get them engaged – we need to keep them engaged because if we lose the ECB we will not be successful. David noted that if the ECB is happy then we are doing the right things.

David then reviewed the draft list of criteria and asked if there were any missing:

- Action has regional or ecosystem impact.
- No entity is currently leading work or more support is needed to advance it.
- Action will likely not happen if not advanced by the Partnership.
- Action lays the foundation for future investment or activities.

The group discussed the need to monitor and make adjustments as we learn things – if we can't say what progress we made in three years we'll cease to exist. Monitoring has typically been the last thing to get funded. The Council may want to have monitoring as a basic principal for all our investments.

Bill Wilkerson likes the criteria but it is missing the partnerships. We need to get the concept of partners into the system.

David reminded the Council that this is the beginning of a strategic work plan for staff and will go through staff and ECB review. There are too many things on the list for the current Partnership staff to complete and we will need to focus our energy on the highest priority actions.

The Council decided that the overarching criteria should be that completing the action will further the Action Agenda.

Dave Somers thinks we may be starting at the wrong point and need the framework in place first. He suggested talking about the framework first.

The Council then reviewed the list of priority projects and provided staff feedback.

Section A comments included:

- Need for benchmarks and indicators to show progress
- Universal items go under "D" and would include enforcement under D1
- Social items under D5 and can expand – this links to social science
- Need to make sure we have bold objects and stretch goals – don't want to overlook the tough stuff

- Need to think about what to do about enforcement – what is our game plan for increasing and enhancing the existing enforcement efforts?

Section B comments included:

- Need to get away from random acts of restoration to a strategic process
- Steve Sakuma suggested a change in the wording “procure resources.” This could conflict with conservation efforts – it is a very complex issue and we need to watch out for unintended consequences (Lynda volunteered to rewrite this portion)
- Need to figure out where major oil spill fits into the list? It is an assignment we have and need to figure out how to carry it out

Section C comments included:

- Stormwater is a major issue – the Council needs to decide where they can provide added value in the “War on stormwater.” This is the place for bold moves, where we can convene and develop a Puget Sound strategy. The Leadership Council can work on the political strategy. This is also where the ECB fits in very well
- Include land use for innovative strategies (working forests and farms)

Billy Frank likes this conversation as it is a little different from business from usual – one goal would be zero discharge. He discussed a secondary treatment system on Fort Lewis.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that Jim Cahill is going to talk about goals tomorrow during the performance management discussion. He wants to make sure we set realistic goals so we don’t set anyone up for failure – zero discharge may make sense for some areas, but we need to be careful and realistic.

Diana Gale is between the two; she believes there are reasons to have stretch goals.

Section D comments included:

- David talked about a pro-bono lawyer group that could look at regulations and help figure out which should be aligned
- Need to assess the customer service when regulating the public
- Might want to partner with the Conservation Districts to provide technical assistance
- Need to check in with Office of Regulatory Reform to see what they are working on
- Two issues were brought forward for continued work:
 - CSO regulations – current regulation is arbitrary and if you could come up with a standard that would meet the Clean Water Act intent
 - Corps Levee issue
- Work on those two first and be successful, then move on to other regulations

Diana would add criteria to make decisions based on science or to answer a science question.

The Council talked about the Foundation and what its role is.

David talked about a job description that will be coming out for a person to lead the communication strategy and help with the needed changes in social behavior. There is a lot going on with Kristen Cooley's work and STORM; the new person will bring all the moving pieces together.

The Council discussed the other things are going on around the Sound that need to be encouraged, supported, and recognized. Communications is a core function of the agency and we will need to use communications to implement the Action Agenda.

Comments on Funding section included:

- To get things done we will need additional funding
- To be able to get the public support we will need to let people know what they are getting for their money
- Need to explore options for a continuous stream of funding which would include the funding district idea

The Council spent some time discussing different ways to put a ballot measure forward and options for fund sources.

RECESS FOR EVENING

To meet several schedule conflicts the meeting will start the meeting at 9:00 a.m. on day two. The Meeting recessed for the evening at 4:20 p.m.

Puget Sound Leadership Council
Meeting Summary

La Quinta Conference Center
Tacoma, Washington

May 28, 2009 - DAY 2

Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Martha Kongsgaard
- Billy Frank, Jr.
- Diana Gale
- Dan O'Neal
- Steve Sakuma
- Bill Wilkerson

Science Panel Chair:

- Joel Baker

Staff and Other Presenters:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Lynda Ransley, Deputy Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Leadership Council
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant for Bill Frank, Jr.
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Mary Beth Brown, Accountability Specialist
- Jim Cahill, Director of Accountability & Budget

RECONVENE MEETING – Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Chair Ruckelshaus welcomed everyone and reconvened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

He reviewed the agenda for the day, adding a presentation by Joe Ryan on progress of integrating the regional liaisons with the salmon team members.

INTEGRATION UPDATE

Joe Ryan provided an update on where he is in assembling the new team. The job description has been posted and applications received. He will be starting interviews and making location assignments next week.

The team will be working with local areas to move the implementation of the Action Agenda along. They will be integrating the efforts using information gathered by the Integration Task Force.

Dan O'Neal asked Joe if he plans to work at an Action Area level. Joe believes the Lead Entity areas will continue to be important and in some areas may become the local Action Agenda-integrating entity. Different areas may be set up differently, but the ECB Action Area representatives will continue to play a key role.

The Council discussed the need to keep the efforts moving forward so we don't lose the local enthusiasm we had during the planning process. We haven't been as visible in the Action Areas for the past six months, and we need to give them a clear direction and a path forward so we don't lose the positive incentive and movement.

Joe thanked Chair Ruckelshaus for his guidance over the past couple months in putting this effort together.

Martha Kongsgaard is glad to see Joe is hiring from within the agency but cautioned him that sometimes moving to a new position doesn't work. She would encourage Joe to get the right people for the jobs. We want the "cream of the crop" since they will be our face for the local areas.

Joe will provide a fuller briefing on his efforts at a future meeting.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT COMMUNICATION TOOLS – Martha Neuman, Jim Cahill, and Mary Beth Brown

Martha Neuman introduced this agenda item.

Jim Cahill provided the definition informing the Council that this is the accountability system and the way to measure success. Chair Ruckelshaus suggested putting accountability in parenthesis to help avoid confusion.

Jim and Mary Beth presented information from the workshop that was held to work through targets and benchmarks and explained the process to the Council members.

The Council discussed how this work is to be used and the need to test how this will work for the local entities. Local areas will have different priorities and will need to have both the ecosystem and individual area reporting.

Joel Baker likes the framework, giving David and staff kudos to finding the best tool to do this work.

David thanked Mary Beth for the work she has done in finding the best options available.

The Council is supportive of moving forward with this effort.

Martha Neuman reviewed the decision milestone timeline:

- June – staff work to prepare framework
- July – draft framework ready for initial review
- July – Present at Leadership Council and ECB meetings
- August – present information at meetings with agencies and individual ECB members
- September – refinement based on ECB input and Science Panel review
- October – final refinement and conclusions

The Council discussed how this is an evolutionary process and getting buy-in will be the hard part. Bill stressed the need to write things up in a way that provides positive results; remove finger pointing; and show the benefits of working with us on this process.

Joel reported that on June 24 the Science Panel will be deciding on 12 indicators to forward to the Science Policy Advisory group for final approval by the Leadership Council in July.

MONITORING GOVERNANCE – Scott Redman and Karen Dinicola (See meeting materials for details.)

Scott Redman presented the proposed Monitoring Governance options for Leadership Council approval. Scott reviewed the process used and reason for the need to decide on monitoring governance process.

Scott reviewed the staff recommendation to house the monitoring forum in house, although there is support for both options.

Martha Kongsgaard noted that staff recommends this be housed at the Partnership, but didn't read why the staff made that recommendation.

Scott noted that he believes either would work. The staff recommendation was based on our having the existing structure, not wanting to build new bureaucracies, and now not being the time to spend the funds to start a new institute.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted the Assistant Attorney General's report states that the Partnership doesn't have the authority to start a new institute without a statutory change – so seems like the only option at this time is to house it in the Partnership. Could later decide to make the changes necessary to move to an independent institute.

He talked to Karen Dinicola about the good work her group has done in the short timeframe they have been in existence.

Public Comment:

Heather Trim, representing the Environmental Caucus, noted it is a rare occasion when the Environmental Caucus and Boeing are on the same page, and this is an issue they agree on: Both are in favor of an independent institute. The need for legislative change is a hurdle that has been needed many times. She disagrees that either model would work – each could work, if done correctly.

Heather Kibbey, City of Everett, believes the independent institute would have a better fund source with local and private support.

Mel Oleson, Boeing Company, supports the independent format. He believes this provides flexibility, transparency, and consistency, and has better ability to market itself for consistent funds.

Jim Simmonds, King County and chair of stormwater workgroup, reported that King County staff is in agreement with support of an independent institute. He would start small and grow as needed, starting with stormwater. He is concerned that a transition without an end-goal the program would not get out of the Partnership.

Council Discussion:

Council members had questions for the public comment panel:

Q - Several suggested funding would be easier for independent group – what is the basis for that?

A - Would be a bottom up funding system not top down, and would use a rate-paying program, which would be able to sustain itself over time.

Q – Suggestion that an independent institute would have more trust and accountability, why?

A - Trying to separate actions from monitoring/outcomes; may build more credibility – separation of having the other groups that are monitoring work that aren't charged with doing the work.

Q – Hasn't heard from the tribes – what is their thought on this issue?

A – Terry Wright noted that the tribes have endorsed the need to have the Partnership get working on this issue immediately. They would support transitioning later to some other opportunity and are currently exploring a center through University of Washington (UW).

Q - Is a broader institute with monitoring through UW a third option?

A - Joel Baker reported that there is an institute working its way through the UW, but doesn't necessarily have monitoring included in the plan.

The Council discussed the need to make the decision at this meeting. They do not believe they need to, or even could, make a final decision today. There is no way to set up an institute without Governor and legislative support, but they do need to get information now and need to get the monitoring in place as soon as possible. One suggestion was to hire someone one really good to lead this effort with the understanding this person would be eligible to be hired as the Executive Director if an independent institute is created later. The Council wants to do a good, thorough study of all the current monitoring efforts and identify the best way to coordinate these efforts. Council members generally like the idea of an independent group, but we need to get things started now. If trust is an issue it is understood - people don't trust government. But as a new agency the Council would like to be given a chance. If they can't put together a transparent, workable system then they don't deserve the trust. There are lots of questions that need to be answered, such as efficiencies.

Diana Gale suggested getting started now but put off the vote until next May or June, and in the meantime, put together a set of options that has been vetted with the various monitoring entities, tribes, agencies, University, etc., and then make the final decision at that time.

Scott suggested date certain should be June of 2010.

Bill Wilkerson made a **MOTION** to support staff recommendation points one and two and revise point three to consider all options, but defer decision on the final governance structure until June 2011:

1. Establish a steering committee to oversee and ensure stakeholder engagement in the program,
2. Hire a monitoring program coordinator to shepherd program development. Hire additional staff as needed to develop the program, and
3. Establish and commission a technical committee and topic-specific technical work groups to evaluate monitoring program needs and develop coordinated study designs and implementation approaches.

Dan O'Neal asked to **AMENDED** the date to June 2010. Bill **ACCEPTED** the proposed amendment. Dan the **SECONDED** the motion as amended. Council **APPROVED** the option for decision in June 2010 for monitoring governance.

The Council talked about the credibility and funding issues and discussed how the Partnership has high credibility in Washington, D.C. and the Council believes the Partnership will be able to get more credibility here as they complete more actions.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound, is thrilled with the performance management/accountability structure presented this morning and commended Mary

Beth's work. Also provided a cautionary note about monitoring and having the same group who is responsible for the work to monitor the efforts.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL OPERATIONS – Lynda Ransley and Chair Ruckelshaus

October 22 & 23, 2008, Meeting Summary Approval

Bill Wilkerson **MOVED** approval of the October 22 & 23, 2008, Leadership Council Meeting Summary. Martha Kongsgaard **SECONDED**. Council **APPROVED** the October 22 & 23, 2008, Leadership Council Meeting Summary as presented.

South Central Puget Sound Action Area Representative

Bill Wilkerson **MOVED** approval of Theresa Jennings as the interim South Central Puget Sound Action Area Representative with final decision in the fall. Dan O'Neal **SECONDED**. Council **APPROVED** the interim appointment.

June 15, 2009, Work Session

Chair Ruckelshaus discussed the possibility of cancelling the previously scheduled June 15 Work Session. Council **APPROVED** cancelation of the June Work Session.

Leadership Council Terms

Three Leadership Council members are coming up to the end of their first term on the Council. Appointments on the Council are a Governor decision. Tammy Owings will check on the process to use with the Governor's Boards and Commissions Office and get back to the Council. The Council may want to have the Chair or David send a letter of support to the Governor's office.

Flagged Issues:

- Write up a draft process for project approvals (SRFB, PSAR, ESRP, etc.) that will simplify and provide efficiencies to address project priorities across funding sources with different with different objectives aligned with Action Agenda and role of Leadership Council.
- Provide copies of the final revised Action Agenda to Leadership Council members when available.
- Check with the Office of Regulatory Reform to see what they are doing with streamlining of regulatory efforts.
- Convene stormwater group for serious analysis and strategy on stormwater.
- Use Leadership Council meetings to move things forward (monitoring, integration, stormwater, etc.).
- When talking about performance management put (accountability) in parens so that it is less confusing.
- Start working on monitoring governance - put together a set of options that has been vetted with the various monitoring entities, tribes, agencies, University, etc. and then make a decision June 2010.

- Meet with OSAC (Oil Spill prevention/response advisory responsibility, stakeholders, and roles).
- Meet with the Federal and State Caucus members to find out their work plans associated with the Action Agenda.

Science Policy Advisory Groups

Martha Neuman reported that she is still finalizing the ECB membership on the various groups. This will be finalized next week and posted for the public. The first group that needs to get going is the Performance Management Group. Staff will convene the meetings as needed.

Other:

Leadership Council members want to be informed of significant meetings being held around the Sound; staff needs to coordinate with Council members if they need them at Action Area meetings.

The Partnering Process needs to be on the July Meeting Agenda.

July 16 the Council will join a press corps tour of land uses in the Skagit with the regular meeting being held on July 17 only.

12:43 p.m. ADJOURN

Leadership Council Approval



Bill Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date 7/17/09

Next Meeting: Next meeting July 16 & 17, 2009
 WSU Research Center
 Mount Vernon, Washington